Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter referred to as "AAPA"), in view of Mocquard et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0232604 A1, hereinafter referred to as "Mocquard").

It is respectfully asserted that neither the AAPA, nor Mocquard, alone or in combination, disclose an outside unit for receiving waves originating from a satellite with means of:

> "transposition using two transposition frequencies to transpose a satellite reception band to an intermediate frequency band of smaller size than the size of the satellite reception band… and in that the two transposition frequencies are chosen so that there exists an intersection common to the two parts of the band…,"

as described in claim 11.

AAPA discloses a first transposition frequency, *e.g.*, 9.75 GHz, for transposing the first half of the satellite reception band between 10.7 and 11.7 GHz to an intermediate frequency band between 950 and 1950 MHz, and a second transposition frequency, *e.g.*, 10.6 GHz, for transposing the second half of the satellite reception band between 11.7 and 12.75 GHz to an intermediate frequency band between 1100 and 2150 MHz (Specification, page 1, lines 24 - 30). As a result, the satellite reception band is divided into two parts, with each part transposed by only one of the transposition frequencies. In AAPA, there is no intersection of the two parts of the satellite reception band.

Furthermore, as admitted by the Office Action, "AAPA fails to specifically disclose two transposition frequencies are such that a part of the satellite reception band is transposed to the intermediate frequency band in an infradyne manner by using one of the transposition frequencies and another part of the satellite reception band is transposed to the intermediate frequency band in a supra dyne manner by using the other of the transposition

frequencies." (Office Action, page 3) Additionally, AAPA does not describe a transposition in a supradyne manner. (Specification, p. 5, lines 22 – 24) Thus, AAPA does not disclose an outside unit for receiving waves originating from a satellite with means of "transposition using two transposition frequencies to transpose a satellite reception band to an intermediate frequency band of smaller size than the size of the satellite reception band… and in that the two transposition frequencies are chosen so that there exists an intersection common to the two parts of the band…," as described in claim 11.

Mocquard teaches "a transmission system using a reference subcarrier to synchronize a local oscillator 104. The reference subcarrier can be placed at various locations of the band allotted to an operator. The external unit 1 of the reception device comprises frequency-wise selection means 107 which make it possible to select the synchronization subcarrier." (Mocquard Abstract)

In Mocquard, it is the uplink, not the satellite reception band, which undergoes frequency transpositions in an infradyne and supradyne manner. (Mocquard, paragraph 42) Furthermore, Mocquard does not disclose the use of two transposition frequencies with an intersection common to the two parts of the satellite reception band or the use of a second frequency for a supradyne transposition of the satellite reception band. Thus, Mocquard, like AAPA does not disclose an outside unit for receiving waves originating from a satellite with means of "transposition using two transposition frequencies to transpose a satellite reception band to an intermediate frequency band of smaller size than the size of the satellite reception band… and in that the two transposition frequencies are chosen so that there exists an intersection common to the two parts of the band…," as described in claim 11.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by AAPA or Mocquard, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 11 unpatentable. It is also respectfully submitted that currently amended independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 11. Since dependent claims 12-16 and 18-21 are dependent from allowable independent claims 11 and 17, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at

least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Marc Louchkoff

/Brian J. Cromarty/

By: Brian J. Cromarty
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

July 26, 2010